

~~SECRET~~

SECURITY INFORMATION

AUG 22 1952

MEMORANDUM TO THE FILE

SUBJECT: DD/I's interpretation of the "Becker & I Committee Report."

1. On 18 August, DD/I held the following conversation with AD/SI. HMC took longhand notes on the conversations with DD/I's approval. The following is a transcription of these notes:

2. After reviewing all of the previous surveys made on scientific and technical intelligence conditions, and the recommendations included in those surveys, DD/I had come to the conclusion that encouragement should be given to O/SI to carry out the program which is now underway within O/SI. DD/I's position, therefore, is the exact opposite to a repudiation of O/SI's position.

3. For interagency relationships, however, the DD/I desires that we carry on with Defense in a different fashion than that which we have used in certain instances in the past; that we should change the explanation for the "what and why" we are doing some of the things, emphasizing in the future our need to know and to have a program because of our responsibilities in reporting current intelligence ideas.

4. Some people feel that we have been over-selling the CIA responsibility in the coordination field.

5. The intelligence on basic science is at one end of the spectrum and the responsibility for it is on CIA to carry out as a matter of common concern. Similarly, technical intelligence is on the other end of the spectrum with a corresponding responsibility on the Department of Defense to carry on as a matter of common concern. Each organization has a direct interest in the whole field, and each organization will have its interest extended beyond the midpoint of the distance separating the two extremes.

6. O/SI's responsibilities, internally, within the agency, includes support of current intelligence and national intelligence. The former activity could well be used to explain to people outside of the agency, O/SI's interest in particular intelligence ideas and in this activity the agency's interests extend across the board. Just as the military include political ideas in their current intelligence reporting, so do we include scientific and technical. Similarly in the field of national intelligence, we include everything that goes out, or is in need of going out, and just as they comment on subjects not within their field of primary responsibility, so do we have the right to question their conclusions.

This document has been approved for release through the HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM of the Central Intelligence Agency.

This is a TEMPORARY DOCUMENT

only, for the use of DCI/HS.

The record copy has been

released to National Archives

under the HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM.

Date 1/25/91 HRP 89-2Date 1/25/91HRP 89-2

000135

~~SECRET~~
SECURITY INFORMATION

Page 2

7. In explaining DD/I's philosophy and advice to O/SI on manner of handling queries within the next difficult six months, DD/I advised AD/SI to go over the minutes of his S & T committee and quote pertinent paragraphs to the Division Chiefs.

8. In the past, difficulties of SIC working committees arose primarily in the field of guided missiles and to a lesser extent electronics. Similarly, DD/I recommended that the minutes of his committee meetings be read and used as basis of direction to Division Chiefs. DD/I said that he would support us on the creation of ad hoc groups and he expected meetings and discussion to continue, in varying extents, on the subjects of the committees abolished. Medicine was the least controversial of the fields and he would expect no change in procedure. (Developments subsequent to this conversation indicate that Becker does not, at the later date, desire a formal, official organization.) We could well take the initiative in continuing the meetings of this group, which has been successful in the past. In the field of electronics, CIA could take the initiative in calling together an informal discussion group or could needle some person in the Department of Defense, formerly a member of the Electronics Committee, to suggest the discussion group. In the field of guided missiles, certainly we should not take the initiative at this time; if somebody else suggests it, we could fall in with his plans. Perhaps we can work out something with the subgroup on JTIC. Guided missiles were recognized by Becker as a subject more clearly a responsibility of the Department of Defense than some of these other subjects. On BW and CW we should give the Defense people an opportunity to reconvene a group. If they do not do so in a reasonable length of time, we can take the initiative. In any event the groups so established should not be called "Committees." This term seems to be an enigma in the Department of Defense.

9. Finally, the whole subject is to be reviewed in six months. This period of time is believed by DD/I to be a bit short, but nevertheless the agency will take the initiative to review at approximately that time. DD/I expects this review to be made by one or more outsiders, possibly [REDACTED]. After such a review, which would include talks with people in the Department of Defense, [REDACTED] DD/I and AD/SI would decide what the recommendation should be to the DCI.

10. DD/I realized that the coming six months would be a very difficult period for O/SI but urged that an honest effort be made to make this procedure function.

H. MARSHALL CHAPPELL

Distribution: 1--Ops/SI; 1--Prod/SI; 1--GSS/SI; 1--DAD/SI;
1--[REDACTED]; 2--AD/SI

25X1A

1- [REDACTED] ✓